

Community Service News

Vol. XIII

Jan.-Mar., 1955

No. 1

CONTENTS

Correspondence..... 2

PROPAGANDA, COMMUNITY, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL:

I. Propaganda in the Public School..... 3

II. The Public School and the Community..... 16

with reviews of

The Attack on the American Secular School, by V. T. Thayer

The Diminished Mind, by Mortimer Smith

A Sociology of Education, by Wilbur B. Brookover

Schools in Transition, by Robin M. Williams, Jr., and
Margaret W. Ryan

THE PROSPECTS FOR COMMUNAL SOCIETIES,

by Arthur E. Morgan..... 24

with reviews of

Utopia and Experiment, by Henrik F. Infield

People in Ejidos, by Henrik F. Infield and Koka Freier

Cooperative Living magazine

Published quarterly by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. Subscription \$2.00 per year, two years \$3.00. 50¢ per copy.

CORRESPONDENCE

I have been reading the material that Community Service, Inc., has published for the last few years. The last issue, Vol. XII, Nos. 3 and 4, on "Bottom-Up Democracy," I found exceptionally rewarding.

Much of your work, I feel, is directly applicable to some of the thinking that we have been doing here in relation to mental health planning. Too often the concepts of the small community (either in a rural or urban setting) are neglected when we think of mental health.

—LEONARD J. DUHL, M.D.
National Institute of Mental Health

We have developed a system of Scoring Community Desirability which, in detail, scores various items important to the residents of an area, and in each instance we have tried to develop techniques in measuring this mathematically. One of the things we have found which is difficult to measure mathe-

matically is that parents with children in school are not only concerned that the school be a "good one" but seem to be equally concerned that they should be able to feel effective in relation to school policy if they so desire.

I have discussed this problem in some detail in my forthcoming book on Real Estate and City Planning which will be published early in 1955 by Prentice-Hall.

—RICHARD LAWRENCE NELSON
Chicago, Illinois

I have long wished to tell you how much I enjoyed seeing your accounts of Yellow Springs industries in book form, and to know of its wide acceptance. It is with some pride that I recall urging you to consider the material as worthy of book publication instead of magazine articles.

—JAMES DAHIR
Lake Geneva, Wisconsin

Announcing—

Eleventh Annual CONFERENCE ON THE SMALL COMMUNITY

NOVEMBER 15-17, 1955

Yellow Springs, Ohio

Community Service News, issued quarterly by Community Service, Inc., Yellow Springs, Ohio. \$2.00 per year, two years \$3.00. Griscom Morgan, editor.

Community Service, Inc., is an organization to promote the interests of the community as a basic social institution, concerned with the economic, recreational, educational, cultural and spiritual development of its members. Community Service was incorporated in 1940 as a non-profit organization to supply information and service for small communities and their leaders, in the belief that the decay of the American community constitutes a crisis which calls for steady and creative effort. The nation-wide interest expressed during the succeeding years has reinforced this opinion.

PROPAGANDA, COMMUNITY, AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

The American public school is now entering an era of emphasis on the community at a time when centralization of power, mass communication and propaganda are tending to supersede the community. This community emphasis in the public school needs to be carefully related to the whole scene and to social and educational philosophy if it is to be more than an unbalanced transient fad.

Four recent books on education which have come to us for review throw some light on this issue, though they deal with four different phases of education and were not written with this as their authors' primary concern.* We review them as part of our discussion of: first, propaganda and the public school; and secondly, the relation of the school to the community.

I. PROPAGANDA IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

The first of the four books referred to is *The Attack on the American Secular School*, by Thayer. This and *The Diminished Mind*, by Mortimer Smith, bear upon the issue, Who owns the mind of the child?

In the ancient community such an issue seldom would have arisen. The child was part of an indivisible community. It would grow up in the pervading influence of the community spirit, and would become like the older generation. It would take the place of its parents as a part of that invisible, organic whole, the community.

Before the times of formal schooling, when all education was through informal, natural participation in community life, the children, mingling with their elders through the community, were exposed to all the views, arguments, opinions and doctrines current in the community. They heard every side of every controversial question, as did everyone. Old and young together gradually arrived at a common judgment or consensus. So far as the total community pattern allowed, this all-round experience encouraged proportion and balance of opinion and judgment. Where the culture as a whole held some mythology or provincial view, the children would absorb that, too.

* *The Attack on the American Secular School*, by V. T. Thayer (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951, 257 pages, \$3.00).

The Diminished Mind, by Mortimer Smith (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1954, 150 pages, \$2.75).

A Sociology of Education, by Wilbur B. Brookover (New York: American Book Company, 1955, 525 pages, \$4.75).

Schools in Transition, by Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954, 272 pages, \$3.00).

As more powerful political or military organizations began to dominate local communities, the heads of these power groups learned to intrench themselves by indoctrinating children and youth with their particular ideologies, or with doctrines that would help perpetuate their power, such as that of the divine right of kings, or the belief that they were special agents of the deity; and so far as possible they would prevent any contrary point of view from being presented. Thus the free play of discussion of the old-time community began to be restricted. Children came to be more and more at the mercy of those in power, and if the propaganda was effectively and persistently maintained, as the children grew up they largely took on the mental pattern which those in power intended them to have.

The child is the future. Whoever controls its growth determines the culture of the future, and the locus of power. Under the propaganda of prevailing power, education tended to become "a process for taking advantage of the helplessness of the young." The art of achieving continuity of power by propaganda has become deeply entrenched in human affairs. As one locus of power after another has declined in vigor, a new element would fill the void and establish its continuing power by its own propaganda. Sometimes two or more lines of propaganda, such as church and state, would operate concurrently, dividing the field between them. Thus it might seem that there is an endless vicious circle of propaganda which never could be broken.

The settlement of America provided a rare opportunity for breaking that circle. As people poured into the new land from many cultures, bearing the marks of many lines of propaganda, these varying strains of propaganda tended to nullify each other, and to leave the people free. As men and women pioneered west across the nearly empty country they traveled light, both as to goods, and as to books and ideas. They tended to shed the old propaganda patterns, and to arrive at conclusions from their own experience and reflection.

In early American education, community control of education was assumed, except as the church intervened. The local school board employed the teachers, and in doing so generally was responsive to the will of the community. On the great American frontier the public school developed with unusual freedom from outside dictation. Because religious loyalties were diverse, there was conscious or tacit agreement to divorce religious teaching from the schools, and this has become a basic tenet of American public education, recognized in our national Constitution, though under constant attack by religious hierarchies introduced from Europe.

The contest for the ownership of the child, and through him of the future, is carried as far by various competing powers as each is able to press

its claim. The Roman Catholic Church, if it could, would totally possess the mind of the child, and so insure the Church's dominance of the future. This is succinctly stated in the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI, of 1929:

Education belongs pre-eminently to the Church by reason of a double title in the supernatural order, conferred exclusively upon her by God Himself: superior therefore to any other title in the natural order.

Since, according to Catholic doctrine, the Church is the divinely appointed and sole custodian of God's truth on earth, it follows in the doctrine of the Church that error has no rights to existence as against truth, and so the Church is right in suppressing any dissident opinion. Since in many cases the Church lacks power to enforce this principle, it is allowable to make concessions to necessity, but only until the time comes when it does have power. So, while the spiritual rule of the church is absolutely anti-democratic, it may yet tolerate and work with democracy so long as the necessity lasts. In the meantime its own children, so far as possible, are to be withdrawn from the democratically controlled public schools, sometimes on threat of excommunication of the parents if they persist in using the public schools.

In earlier days elements of the Protestant Church similarly undertook to control the minds of children, and thereby the cultural pattern of the future. Thayer's book includes a picture of the control in early Massachusetts:

These settlements were religious communities, dedicated to the sublime purposes of bringing into being the Holy Commonwealth. . . . "The belief in their divine election for a great work ceased to be a mere faith and came to be regarded as an empirical fact." . . .

The Holy Commonwealth was in no sense a democracy, or a republic. It was uncorrupted by "false" notions regarding the rights of the non-elect to define the ways of life men should follow. Schools were established as a means for disciplining the will of the child and forming the minds of the future leaders of the Commonwealth, on the assumption, as Parrington remarks of John Cotton, that even the desire for liberty is "the sinful prompting of the natural man, a denial of the religious authority of God's chosen rulers."

According to Thayer it was not until 1827, after a vigorous campaign waged by Horace Mann, that Massachusetts schools were finally freed from religious (sectarian) proselyting.

This spiritual dictatorship is not limited to any one or two religious hierarchies. From ancient times it has been characteristic of the religions of the Mediterranean region and of Southwestern Asia. The tiny Hutterite communities, convinced of being God's agents on earth, try to completely regiment the minds and spirits of their children to their orthodox pattern.

At the close of the volume, which discusses the development of the separation of church and state in America, the elimination of theological teaching in the schools, and the present drive to reintroduce public support of religion, Thayer sums up his conclusion:

We live in a verbal civilization. This accentuates the importance of literacy and the general education of all citizens in the skills and the methods essential for finding one's way around in a world of symbols. No progressive educator worth his salt discounts the importance of the effective training of an academic character. His concern is rather that abstractions be mastered in a context of vital significance to the learner in a manner designed to foster independence and self-direction.

By independence and self-direction I mean, for one thing, steady growth in the methods appropriate to representative areas of knowledge: the method of the social scientist, the method of the natural scientist, the methods that encourage initiative and creative self-expression in the arts. The possibilities of education in reflective thinking constitute as yet an unexplored territory. Not even in the natural sciences have we learned to distinguish between the teaching of "facts" and conclusions, that is, the applications of science, and a genuinely scientific attitude of mind.

Nor are our schools encouraged, as a democracy should encourage them, to develop young people of intellectual fibre who by virtue of this fibre are immune to propaganda and resistant to dogmatism, young people who welcome guidance in their thinking but are not easily "taught," young people to whom the truth is not something formulated once and for all, to be absorbed and accepted and lived as learned but is rather forever a discovery and an adventure.

It is this secular method of thinking that frightens our religious friends since, when acquired in one field, it has the habit of permeating others. And it is precisely because most people will not tolerate its application in the sacred realm of religious belief that we cannot agree to the "teaching" of religion in the schools. Given the scientific attitude there is no danger in dealing with controversial issues. Indeed the winnowing and sifting process of objective search and research for truth is an essential condition for the reconciliation of differences between men and the fruitful cross-fertilization of cultures. Secular thinking so conceived promises peace and good will for men, as the perpetuation of religious differences through indoctrination is a sure guarantee of division and discord. It is the glory of the secular school that at its best it promotes an intellectual training which makes for this harmony and unity. To perpetuate a secular emphasis of this nature is indispensable for the continued growth of the democratic spirit.

* * *

But it is not only the church which undertakes to capture the mind of childhood and youth, and thereby the pattern of the future. For nearly a generation public school textbooks in social science, edited by Harold Rugg and others of similar purpose, have been intentionally and explicitly left-wing propagandist, rather than objective. During the period of the 1930's

while this left-wing movement was in full swing, what was in existence was not the occasional occurrence of an extremist, but a well-worked-out program by a group of educators for control of the schools. Articles in their magazines, *The Social Frontier* and *Progressive Education*, and a few pamphlets of the group, presented a clearly conceived policy. The following quotations were mostly extracted by Paul W. Shafer, member of Congress from Michigan, and included in a book, *The Turning of the Tides*:

The progressive-minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization. . . . In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence necessary to wage successful warfare in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the nation.

Particularly would he [Marx] be pleased to see that at least a few teachers have already gone so far as to unionize themselves as a class, conscious of interests fundamentally separate from most school boards or from others sympathetic with the status quo.

The actual administration of the school must be left to those who are technically competent—the teachers of the country.

Mortimer Smith, in *The Diminished Mind*, vigorously attacks this process of propaganda in the schools. (One gets an impression, however, that what he most dislikes is not the *process of propaganda*, but the application of that process to left-wing social theories.) In his chapter on "Educational Brainwashing" he tells of efforts of left-wing educators to fix in the minds and in the emotions of children a specific social pattern. He describes a project in the Fleetwood, Minnesota, high school, conducted in 1944 by Theodore Brameld, then Associate Professor at Minnesota State University, aimed to develop "by cooperative thinking and exploration a blueprint of our future society." At the end of the course a test was given. To quote Mortimer Smith:

If the student denied that the following statements, among others, were true he was marked down as being "illiberal":

"What this country needs is more T.V.A.'s."

"Income taxes on the rich should be greatly increased."

"Our economic base must be shifted from rugged individualism to economic planning."

The student was also considered to lack liberality of thought if he felt the following statements were true:

"Liberal interpretation of the Constitution has permitted too great expansion of the powers of the federal government."

"There is too much bureaucracy in government already."

"Free competition is essential to healthy operation of our economic system in normal times."

Mortimer Smith mentions a pamphlet, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*, by George S. Counts, Columbia University, written in 1932, toward the beginning of the movement to liberalize our schools by propaganda. The following is from that publication:

My thesis is that complete impartiality is utterly impossible, that the school must shape attitudes, develop tastes, and even impose ideas. . . . Our major concern consequently should be, not to keep the school from influencing the child in a positive direction, but rather to make certain that every Progressive school will use whatever power it may possess in opposing and checking the forces of social conservatism and reaction. . . .

If we may now assume that the child will be imposed upon in some fashion by the various elements in his environment, the real question is not whether the imposition will take place, but rather from what source it will come. . . . That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. . . . It is my observation that the men and women who have affected the course of human events are those who have not hesitated to use the power that has come to them. . . . It is scarcely thinkable that these men and women would ever act as selfishly or bungle as badly as have the so-called "practical" men of our generation—the politicians, the financiers, the industrialists. If all of these facts are taken into account, instead of shunning power, the profession should rather seek power and then strive to use that power fully and wisely and in the interests of the great masses of the people.

What the aim of this capture and use of power was to be may be inferred from the leading editorial in the initial number of *The Social Frontier*, edited by George S. Counts and W. H. Kilpatrick:

For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch.

That the effort to capture the mind of American children was not wholly unsuccessful is indicated by a statement of one of the leaders of this group, Harold H. Rugg. Discussing the feasibility of textbooks to further his "great ideas," he wrote in 1942:

I know, for I tried to do it during the great depression in my *Man and His Changing Society*—a series of books which was studied by some 5,000,000 young Americans until the patrioteers and the native Fascist press well-nigh destroyed it between 1939 and 1941.

Criticism of these books was met by agonized charges that school boards were narrow, bigoted and intolerant, and by appeals for freedom for the schools. However, the children being indoctrinated had no choice of the

textbooks given them to use, nor usually had the parents. Rugg's textbooks presented highly controversial theories and issues as simply plain statements of unquestioned fact or knowledge, as rules of arithmetic would be stated.

Counts has now given up his former left-wing political views. That is important. But the larger issue is, would he still present to children attitudes, sympathies, views and data as representative for forming their views of life, when the views presented are substantially controversial; or on such matters would he, while providing representative information pro and con, leave their minds, their emotions and their attitudes free and uncommitted?

It would be fortunate if we could say that such biased propaganda is a rare and sporadic phenomenon in the life of the American public school. But that is not the case. The American school has always had to fight for its freedom from propaganda, and as often from the right as from the left.

Just at the close of the American Revolution there was an occurrence which was of great import in the history of our country, but which for more than a century and a half has been ignored or passed over as an unimportant incident by the history books available to American school children. We refer to Shays' Rebellion. The rich and powerful landlords of western Massachusetts and eastern New York undertook to dispossess the small landowners, and to make themselves into feudal country gentlemen, served by lowly peasants. At the close of the Revolutionary War, when the small landowners returned from the Revolutionary army with their continental "scrip" for their pay, the large landowners refused to take this, threw the returning soldiers into jail for debt, and took their land. Shays' Rebellion was in protest against this treatment. It was followed by a liberal landslide in the Massachusetts legislature and governorship, and that went far to insure the adoption of the Bill of Rights amendments to our Constitution, which included prohibition of imprisonment for debt.

For many years thereafter Boston firms, owned by upper-class families, largely supplied America's school textbooks. In those textbooks this very significant episode in American history was ignored, or given brief reference as the activity of "a few malcontents" in the western part of the state. That blind spot in school histories has persisted for more than a century and a half.

Nor need we go back to the beginning of our nation to find right-wing propaganda in our public schools. Here let me introduce a personal account. At about the time this pamphlet by George Counts was written, certain powerful financial interests also were active in the process of trying to capture the minds of our children, and by that means to control the social climate of our society. By chance I came into intimate contact with one such effort. A certain man who was quietly associated with large private utility

interests published a pamphlet called *Animal Power versus Machine Power*, and was effective in having perhaps two hundred thousand copies distributed to the schools of Ohio, with the suggestion that they be used by teachers in the schoolroom. Under a thin veneer of economic history this pamphlet was a piece of propaganda aimed to discredit public electric power, and to convince school children of the superiority and excellence of the private utility companies.

This man addressed the students of one of our state universities on the same subject. When a student publication suggested that he was in the employ of the private utilities, he threatened suit against the institution or its administration unless the administration or the governing board should apologize. This it meekly did. A little later he addressed the student body of one of the largest and most highly regarded private colleges of the state. Again a student publication hinted that he was in the employ of the private utilities. Again he threatened suit unless an apology should be made, and again an apology was made. The fear of the administrators and trustees probably was not of this individual, but of the utility interests he represented.

When I criticized this action in a published article, without naming the person, I received a letter from him threatening me with a suit unless I should retract my statements. I had taken the precaution to have a search made of his background, and had detailed data as to his undercover employment by private utility companies as a public relations man. I told him I had this information, and invited him to take action. That was the last I heard of him directly, though he was long active with churches and civic groups, proselyting for the private utility interests.

* * *

It is not only elements in the church, among the left-wing teachers, and in business, which have tried to capture the schools, and thereby to control the future thinking of the country. Among the latest, the most ambitious and the most successful to enter the contest are some state departments of education. Mortimer Smith, in *The Diminished Mind*, enters into combat with these offenders, along with their associates in the field of school administration. He quotes Dean Marten Ten Hoor on the over-professionalizing of education, and the capture of power:

They convinced the public and the state legislatures of the rightness of their cause. They gained virtual control of the laws and the administration of teacher certification. They became a powerful, sometimes a dominating, influence in accrediting associations in the field of higher education.

Mortimer Smith draws attention to a condition, noted by many other concerned persons, which is that teacher training schools have so piled up re-

quirements of *methods* in education that there is no adequate time to reach the content of the subjects. He adds:

The chief method the Education lobby has used to gain control has been through the certification of teachers; they have so effectively lobbied their point of view in the state legislatures that today only a miracle can get a well-qualified person in the scholastic sense into the schools without exposure to "professional" education. . . . There is increasing evidence to show that the teacher-training institutions—which have, in the words of the Harvard Report, "taught everything except the indispensable thing, the love of knowledge"—are providing us with teachers who are our most poorly educated citizens.

He states that of 97,800 college freshmen examined for draft deferment in 1951, education students ranked lowest of all. Of engineers, 68 per cent passed, other callings were in descending scale to education students, of whom only 27 per cent passed. Seniors in education did little better than freshmen.

Smith quotes various high ranking university men to reinforce his statement as to the profession-bound quality of those who rule the schools. The point of drawing attention to this condition is that these are the men who have seized power in the public school system, as Counts proposed, though not generally with any left-wing intent.

More and more, public school policy is being determined at the state level, with less and less power or participation by the communities affected. Only occasionally is there a public statement of a philosophy of this control. The following, by a state department of education official in one of our most populous states, expresses what in many cases has been the actual working policy:

Education is now and always has been regarded as the proper function of the state. [Pope Pius would not have agreed to that.] . . . It cannot be argued that school districts possess any inherent rights or prerogatives. . . . Of course, in the reorganization of school districts, the control exercised by the state is limited by reason of the type and kind of coercion it is able to apply in developing a school finance program.

The power thus gained frequently has been used in reducing the participation of the local community in the determination of school policy. More and more, school children are looked upon as wards of the State Department of Education, with parents and local school boards having little to do with the school but to follow instructions.

* * *

When the pioneers set up schools across America there were relatively few fixed propaganda patterns common to the whole. Especially with reference to religions, of which there were many competing creeds, they decided

to omit all that type of propaganda from the public school. Also, since the social and economic classes were nearly enough equal so that none could clearly dominate, it became fairly general policy to omit special propaganda in the fields of social and economic affairs. The schools would teach what was generally agreed upon, and would leave controversial matters for adult consideration. The principle seldom was so explicitly stated, nor was it ever perfectly applied in all things or at all times and places. But by and large it became the American standard.

This was a great step toward human freedom. The right to acquaintance with all sides of a subject, which was characteristic of the small community life within the limits of its total pattern, came to be somewhat extended to the larger community of the region, the state and the nation. As to the public school, it became good form to omit propaganda, except as to subjects on which everyone was agreed, such as that America was the greatest country in the world. Like the small community of older times, completeness of information was bounded by the limits of the total pattern. There were many partially distinct patterns which partly limited the fullness of information and understanding of the persons within those patterns, such as the somewhat separate patterns of rich and poor, Protestant and Catholic, orthodox and heterodox, high class and low class, "American" and "foreigner," Republican and Democrat. Yet most of these were not rigid curtains, such as had been left behind in Europe.

This was a new, great kind of freedom, nearly unique in human history. Especially as to the schools, it was recognized with a fair degree of clarity. While this philosophy has largely pervaded the schools of America, usually resisting the many attacks upon it, seldom has it been clearly stated. (Some of our most precious cultural concepts are so much a part of our lives that we do not clearly formulate them in words.) I shall make an effort to state this implicit philosophy concerning conditioning, indoctrination or propaganda as it relates to the American public school system.

The quality of a human culture—of a "civilization"—is determined more largely by the influences of the society in which a child lives than by inborn—genetic—traits. Give a normal man a chance, and he will make something of himself, but that "chance" includes transmitting to him the major elements of the accumulated culture of the race, and especially of his own people. It is an essential part of the American view of life that every normal child has a right to inherit that culture; that is, he has a right to an education.

He must get a large part of his education during his early years, before he has the data of experience or the maturity of mind to form his own judgments as to many matters. Therefore, his early education must consist

largely of "conditioning" or "indoctrination" before he is old enough for independent judgment.

How shall we solve this dilemma? How can we pass on the generally accepted essence of the accumulated culture, and yet avoid indoctrination in what to a considerable part of the population is falsity or error? The way which has been worked out for the American public school, and generally approved by the American people, is a great way, a discovery and an achievement worthy of being passed on to all mankind.

There is what we may call a "due process of social change," equivalent to the "due process of law." There is no more dangerous area of subversion, whether for noble or ignoble purposes, than the shortcutting of that due process by indoctrination of children through our schools and the textbooks used in them. Whether it is the national association of an industry, a powerful church, a utility company, or a group seeking to save the world from atomic warfare, the use of the public school for propaganda and indoctrination in controversial matters is a shortcutting of due process.

Not all human culture is controversial. A very large part of it is almost universally accepted. Almost everyone agrees that reading, writing and figuring are useful tools. Geography is factual, of use or interest to nearly everyone. These can be included in education almost without controversy. History is subject to abuse, from both the right and the left, but the main facts of our background can be taught. Love of our community, of our country, and of mankind can be taught, for we have that in common.

Nearly everyone believes in fair play, in compassion and helpfulness for those in trouble, in mutual respect, in respect for human dignity, in courtesy and in honesty, even though we often fail to live up to our beliefs. Those can be taught. Joy and skill in productive work, competence in mechanical skills, in farming, in business methods, we believe in. Much or most of the well established data and principles of natural science are non-controversial. These and many other things we have in common, and can teach with little prospect of misleading youth.

When we come to highly controversial beliefs or doctrines, the public school will not instill them. Where the existence of such issues is discussed, the fact that they are controversial will be made clear, and the contrasting or conflicting data and points of view will be presented with the care for impartiality that a good judge exercises in presenting a case to the jury. Children may be told that such matters are left to home or church, or that as they reach maturity they will consider these controversial beliefs for themselves, with such help as may be available.

The decision as to what is or is not controversial cannot be standardized for all communities and cultures in the nation, for what is controversial in

one culture or community may be very different from what is controversial in another. The Hopi Indians do well to recognize the controversy as to how to assimilate the desirable elements of occidental culture; whereas to white people in that region the controversy might be the question of what enduring values lie in the Hopis' non-violent way of life. Likewise we do well to recognize controversies which may exist between the seemingly unanimous opinion of the day and the considered, long-time judgments of the spiritual leaders of mankind.

How does this principle work concerning the changing views of men? There was a time when practically all men believed that the earth is flat. That being so, it was proper to teach that belief to children. Then came a time when pioneer thinkers held that the earth is a sphere, and moves around the sun. In the course of a century belief in the new doctrine had grown so strong that there clearly was no consensus of opinion. The status of the earth was a matter of controversy. During such a period children would be made aware of the uncertainty, and that they might reach their own conclusions as they matured. Later, when the new doctrine became generally accepted, it was proper to teach the new view. In this way the cultural inheritance may change and grow, and yet not be lost.

Is not that substantially the process which took place in the ancient small community? With extremely limited communication beyond the borders of the community, change of outlook was slow. Today our community of communication is far larger, but fundamentally the same process is valid. As communication and interaction expand to take in all men we need only to enlarge the ways of the ancient village community.

In the ancient community, which was the environment in which its children were reared, the heart of the process of reaching agreement was that any question was mulled over by the entire community, old and young, until there emerged a general agreement or consensus. To eliminate community from the lives of school children, as to such a large extent is coming to be the result of present school methods, is a serious inroad upon the natural processes of growth.

Who owns the child? Neither the state, nor the church, nor the profession of educators, nor the industrialists who control the money, nor any reformers who would use him to make the world over.

No one owns the child. We all in varying degrees are his guardians, trustees during his immaturity, concerned to help that immaturity grow into self-directing maturity. Trusteeship does not exploit, it guards and protects. Exploitation always is a crime against humanity, whether it is by parents who would neglect the growth of children in order to use them

as economic assets, by a church which tries to justify its manipulations by claiming a special, sole charter from God, or by the state on the ground that there must be a supreme sovereignty, or by the teaching profession on the ground that it alone is competent for that trusteeship; or by reformers who would use the schools to create a new social order.

The most active objection raised today to that view is that the present crisis in human affairs is so acute that this process of social change is too slow to avert impending disaster. It seems necessary to "jump the gun" and to cut corners by arbitrary and perhaps violent propaganda, ignoring the requirements of the due process of social change, in order to save mankind.

Our comment on this state of mind is twofold: first, the crisis itself is a consequence of this very process of ignoring the due process of social change. Second, we hold that these due processes hold within themselves greater power and potential for effective change—in time of crisis as at other times—than any short-cutting of them can have, just as good engineering cannot be superseded in time of great necessity by rash ignoring of physical principles. It was the deeply committed nonviolent Jesus, and not the violent leader of the zealots bent on military rebellion, who was the man of the future in ancient Palestine. The violence of propaganda can be as serious in its consequences as the atomic bomb.

We repeat the doctrine presented by Counts in his pamphlet, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?*:

If we now assume [and he did assume it] that the child will be imposed upon in some fashion by the various elements of his environment, the real question is not whether imposition will take place, but rather from what source it will come.

In the great American tradition, it is "a question of whether imposition of (controversial) doctrines will take place." It is the business of every American to see that it does not. The age-long method of competition to capture the mind of childhood, and thereby to control the mind of the future, has been to "fight fire with fire," to combat propaganda with counter-propaganda. The new way, that of the American public school, is to forego propaganda on controversial issues. Teach the accepted truth and the habit of open-minded inquiry, and trust to the common reasonableness of men. As mature men, seek truth and probe error, and so enlarge the area of general agreement. To fight irresponsible propaganda by irresponsible propaganda is the way of the ancient past. The way of the American public school, quite clearly conceived, though imperfectly lived up to, is to see authority over childhood as a trust to be treated with reverence and responsibility, not as power to be grasped and exploited to the limit. Only as

authority and power are held in that way are men civilized.

It is of the very essence of civilization that men restrain the use of the power they have, that restraint being governed by ethical principles. The various breaches of such proper restraint which we have referred to, whether by church or state or by economic power, or by zealous ideological teachers, reduce the quality of our public schools, mar the common life, and menace our culture. But the spirit of America is strong. It has broken through many such barriers in the past, and we have faith that it will continue to do so, and that it will preserve this precious heritage of the freedom of our schools from violation by propaganda.

II. THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY

What actual relations exist between the school and the community?

Up to a century and a half ago most real education for most of the population was acquired almost unconsciously in the ordinary practices of life in home and community. For those elements which could not be so well transmitted informally by everyday life, the school was set up to supply a limited supplement to that age-old informal process. The school was the home of "the three R's." People did not think of the common experiences of life as being educational, and gave their allegiance to the conventional subject matter.

The early American school system did not have a clear-cut philosophy or ideology. While there were some learned school men with definite theories of education, yet public education, because of its great mass, was more than such men could control, and the American public school in fact developed in a traditional, practical, rule-of-thumb way. That very process, while it brought freedom from some obsolete theories, myths and feudal traditions, yet gave the school a kind of rigidity, for each generation became a somewhat unthinking repetition of the last. The schools of the earlier generations having been rather primitive and routine, the present tended to maintain that pattern. The three R's—"readin', 'ritin', and 'rithmetic"—with natural expansions into geography and American history, took a grip on the American mind which even yet is not wholly broken.

In *A Sociology of Education* Brookover pictures the recent evolution of educational principles and practice. He sees American public school education as historically beginning with almost nothing but subject matter teaching, commonly referred to as "the three R's." The curriculum was subject-centered, not effectively concerned either with the personal development of the child beyond his absorption of subject matter, or with his relation to his community. From that state it developed through "progressive education"—in which the interests of the individual child are the center of attention, with little concern for social responsibility—to yet further transi-

tion, with the school becoming community-centered.

After three hundred pages discussing the sociology of education, Brook-over pictures the change from the earlier pattern:

In the past, and even to some extent in the present, many schools have operated as though they existed in a vacuum, apart from the community which nurtured them. Led by John Dewey, the movement for progressive education provided a needed corrective for the academic school, reducing its emphasis on discipline, rote memory, and abstract knowledge. The progressives stressed activity programs, education for life, and individual expression.

With the publication of the criticisms of George Counts and W. H. Kilpatrick, and more recently of Edward G. Olsen and Lloyd A. Cook, many educators became conscious of certain grave defects in the child-centered school of the progressive education group. Counts argued that the movement lacked social orientation and was characterized by extreme individualism or anarchy. Kilpatrick argued for community study and action, while Olsen and Cook gave leadership to the community approach to educational problems.

The community school . . . goes beyond the needs of the pupil to give the educational pattern a social orientation. The curriculum is built around the major processes and problems of human living rather than the child's areas of interest. It believes in systematically serving the community and utilizing that community as a major educational resource rather than using it only incidentally as in past procedures. . . . The transition from the old academic school to the more recent community emphasis might well be described as a movement from book-centered through child-centered to the current life-centered school.

Thus at the end of a century-long evolution of educational pattern we find the community and the school as two of the main centers of legitimate interest in the continuity of culture, each vitally in need of the other. And when we speak of the community to which the school shall be related, what do we mean? Children can be herded through great metropolitan industries or art galleries, and we may call that community experience. However, for children to take vital part in community life, not just as observers, but as participators, the community should be of human size. At best that means small, face-to-face, primary-group communities. The author quotes Lloyd Cook:

The community has concrete reality. It is neither too large nor too small, too far away nor too near at hand, to have meaning for the student. Its life and structure can be analyzed with some assurance that the elements will not slip through one's grasp. Finally, it is the place we know most about and in which we are most at home. . . . From the educational standpoint, the local world is the fundamental unit of learning and teaching. It is the child's greatest educator, for in it he comes of age. [*Community Backgrounds of Education*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950.]

This concept of the community-centered school, while it is steadily gaining ground, is yet far from general acceptance. The human habit, which runs back to our prehuman ancestors, of doing in this generation what was done in the last, seldom allows rapid changes in established societies. Our author writes:

Although there has been a shift in the educational philosophy from a subject-centered to a community-experience-centered school, the subject curriculum still remains the dominant type. . . . "Ground covering" has been the guiding principle of curriculum construction. A student coming in from another school has his record carefully checked. He is classified for future work on the basis of work or "ground" covered.

The author comes to his conclusion: "The child is a complete being educated by a total environment. Education is not something to be abstracted as a segment in the experience and development of human behavior."

It is characteristic of professional educators, as of professionals in many other fields, that they incline to single-track thinking. First it was subject matter and personal discipline for maintaining order, and little else. Then came the progressive educator, bent on "self-expression" for the child, with inadequate regard either for subject matter or for social responsibility. Now comes the socially-oriented, or the community-oriented school, with too little interest in subject matter or in development of individuality, but with much interest in social relations.

Life is not like that. If one is to handle the everyday problems of life in an orderly and economical manner he must master appropriate subject matter. To give it but minor attention will greatly handicap boys and girls. Social attitudes and community participation are important, and should have attention which they have lacked. Yet to give a monopoly of attention to socialization and to social adaptation is to destroy or to mutilate individuality and personality.

To be able to act independently of the social drift is highly important. Seldom does a man achieve greatness who does not determinedly keep to his own course against the steady pressure of current custom. A part of every child's education should be to practice going his own way in important matters, independent of the crowd. Such independence must be learned by practice in the community, not just by reading about it. Good education does not lie in surrender to any one of these patterns, but in holding to all of them, and in keeping them in good relation to each other. Also it calls for acting in good faith, in the spirit of education, and not in the spirit of the propagandist. Any form of education can be violated and distorted by using it as an instrument of power.

Another book on our list illustrates the need for proportion and balance. In *The Diminished Mind, A Study of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools*, Mortimer Smith takes issue with those who would surrender subject matter for social adjustment. In two chapters entitled "Adjustment Replaces Education," he quotes and criticizes authorities on socialized education who take the position that, first: The educational powers-that-be have concluded that only about forty per cent of American youth are capable of profiting by the old-style type of high school subject-matter education. Second, the education of the sixty per cent should greatly reduce academic subject-matter teaching, replacing it with social experience. Third, having reached this conclusion, they decide that this nonscholarly education is good for *all* students as it develops their social consciousness. The author holds that this process tends to reduce the entire culture to mediocrity. The more radical advocates of socialized education, in repudiating the emphasis on intellectual interests, seem to have gone to extremes. Mortimer Smith quotes, as an extreme expression of this attitude, from a paper in the *Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals:

Through the years we've built a sort of halo around reading, writing, and arithmetic. We've said they were for everybody. . . . When we come to the realization that not every child has to read, figure, write and spell . . . that many of them either cannot or will not master these chores . . . then we shall be on the road to improving the junior high curriculum. . . . We shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to perform on the violin.

(Why not be really liberal and hold that it is not necessary for every child to learn to speak his mother tongue?)

This doubtless is an extreme statement, but it draws attention to the disregard for thoroughgoing mastery of subject matter and of scholarship characteristic of some modern teaching which places overemphasis on "life adjustment" or on community experience. Yet so has the author of this book gone to the other extreme. He would incline to eliminate from the work of the school any participation in the life experience in the community or, as the educators call it, "adjustment to society." He writes:

Nor do I find it easy to accept the doctrine that the school must educate the whole child; to do so it would have to assume the functions of the home and community, to the neglect of *its own functions*. [*Italics added.*] . . . What would probably be of some help at this particular point is the formation of a small commission—academic, or part academic and part lay—which would undertake a serious study of the schools. . . . I think such a commission should be frankly "slanted" in that its membership should be

expected to believe in *education* [italics in the original], not training or adjustment, as a worthy ideal for all in a democracy.

In effect, Mortimer Smith would make *education* a private word, to mean what he wishes it to mean. He would deny the validity of such definitions as this among those given in *Webster's International Dictionary*: "The totality of the information and qualities acquired through instruction and training, which further the development of an individual physically, mentally and morally; as, a liberal *education*." Nor would he agree with the only illustration of the word's use given in the dictionary: "To prepare us for complete living is the function which *education* has to discharge.—Herbert Spencer." He would recognize the services of the home and the community, but he would put those and the school into separate worlds, with no common undertakings. Believers in the community school, on the other hand, would bring the community into the school and the school into the community, making a single process of the whole, as was the case with child development during the many millenniums of human existence up to the last few centuries.

Those who would promote interaction of school and community are not adding some new and strange element to education. They are simply trying to preserve, under more difficult modern conditions, what through the ages has been the chief and most vital cultural element in the growth of human personalities, both individually and socially—the education which comes from living in society. Thayer, in the book, *The Attack on the American Secular School*, sums up the matter:

The obvious fact that modern conditions of living tend to deprive young people of firsthand and responsible occasions that once promoted social maturity . . . points the need for the creation within the school of opportunities for service. Within the school, did I say? I should have said, it means a breaking down of water-tight compartments between the school and the community so that in ways appropriate to different age levels and abilities children are privileged to experience early and continuously the satisfaction that comes from playing a responsible role in family, school and community.

* * *

To divert for a moment from this review: In reading about the present controversy over subject matter versus firsthand experience in education one might think that it is something new. Yet it has been raging for centuries. More than two centuries ago William Penn wrote:

We are in Pain to make them Scholars, but not Men! To talk, rather than to know, which is Canting.

The first Thing obvious to Children is what is sensible; and that we

make no Part of their rudiments.

We press their Memory too soon, and puzzle, strain, and load them with Words and Rules; to know Grammer and Rhetorick, and a strange Tongue or two, that it is ten to one may never be useful to them; Leaving their natural Genius to Mechanical and Physical, or natural Knowledge uncultivated and neglected; which would be of exceeding Use and Pleasure to them through the whole Course of their Life.

To be sure, Languages are not to be despised or neglected. But Things are still to be preferred.

Children had rather be making Tools and Instruments of Play; Shaping, Drawing, Framing, and Building, etc., than getting some Rules of Propriety of Speech by Heart: And those also would follow with more Judgment, and less Trouble and Time.

To follow William Penn's advice would make the community a part of the school, and the school a part of the community.

Nearly a century ago Thomas Carlyle, in his inaugural address as Rector of the University of Edinburgh, expressed himself on this subject. He confessed to a low regard for prevailing education—"The teacher merely operating on the tongue of the pupil, and teaching him to wag it in a particular way." He quotes from Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Travels*, "perhaps the most remarkable bit of writing which I have known to be executed in these late centuries." Three of the world's wisest men are discussing education. "The Chief, who is the Eldest of the three, says to Wilhelm:"

Healthy well-formed children bring into the world with them many precious gifts; and very frequently these are best of all developed by Nature herself, with but slight assistance, where assistance is seen to be wise and profitable, and with forbearance very often on the part of the overseer of the process. But there is one thing which no child brings into the world with him, and without which all other things are of no use. . . . It is . . . Reverence.

Carlyle continues to paraphrase Goethe:

The eldest [of the wise men] then goes on to explain by what methods they seek to educate and train their boys; in the trades, in the arts, in the sciences, in whatever pursuit the boy is found best fitted for. Beyond all, they are anxious to discover the boy's aptitudes; and they try him and watch him continually, in many wise ways, till by degrees they can discover this. Wilhelm had left his own boy there, perhaps expecting they would make him a Master of Arts, or something of the kind. . . . He finds that the breaking of colts has been the thing *he* was most suited for.

In his *Leonard and Gertrude* the great Pestalozzi wrote a century and a half ago: "A child is always well educated when he has learned to practice skillfully, orderly, and to the benefit of him and his, what is to be his future occupation." In *The Education of Man*, he wrote:

In my opinion, school instruction that fails to include the full spirit education demands, and that ignores the circumstances in the home in their entirety, is little more than a method of shriveling up our generation. . . .

To arrive at knowledge slowly, by one's own experience, is better than to learn by rote, in a hurry, facts that other people know, and then, glutted with words, to lose one's own free, observant and inquisitive ability to study. . . .

What is the use of all his knowledge to a man who does not know whence his daily bread is to come?

Pestalozzi's greatest pupil, Friedrich Froebel, expressed himself similarly:

Every sharply defined stage of human culture, such as that under which we now live, demands a system of education which shall embrace the whole being of man, his mental and natural sides, and all his varied affinities and relations, and shall therefore, as true to both man and child, educate the latter progressively and by development, in such a way as to produce and constantly maintain a sense of unity and completeness running through the whole of his life.

Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, describes how even the university began as a community function. Speaking of conditions in medieval Europe, he wrote:

To have served an apprenticeship in the town under a master properly qualified, is commonly the necessary requisite for obtaining this freedom [to work at a trade.] . . . Seven years seems to have been, all over Europe, the usual term established for the duration of apprenticeships in the greater part of incorporated trades. All such incorporations were anciently called universities; which indeed is the proper Latin name for any incorporation whatever. The university of smiths, the university of taylors, etc., are expressions which we commonly meet with in the old charters of ancient towns. When those particular incorporations which are now peculiarly called universities were first established, the term of years which it was necessary to study, in order to obtain the degree of master of arts, appears evidently to have been copied from the term of apprenticeship in common trades, of which the incorporations were much more ancient. As to have wrought seven years under a master properly qualified, was necessary, in order to entitle any person to become a master, and to have himself apprentices in a common trade; so to have studied seven years under a master properly qualified, was necessary to entitle him to become a master teacher, or doctor (words anciently synonymous) in the liberal arts, and to have scholars or apprentices (words likewise synonymous) to study under him.

* * *

Now, to return to our reviewing: The fourth of the books listed is *Schools in Transition*, by Williams and Ryan. It is an account of actual experience in the process of racial desegregation and integration in American schools. The book is written in a spirit of moderation, and with a good quality of insight. It gathers a wide range of experience, and tells an inter-

esting story. A clear distinction is made between "desegregation" and integration. The elimination of a double school system, one for colored and one for white pupils, is desegregation. Integration is quite another matter. A school may have both white and Negro pupils, and yet there may be no sharing of life beyond the classroom. The separation may be even more obvious and painful than where separate schools are maintained. Integration is the process of transcending race and of sharing all the activities of the school, in classroom and in "extracurricular" activities as well.

To some degree desegregation can be brought about by outside authority, with the support of law and courts. That was the course of things in Cairo, Illinois. The local authorities played their parts with dignity, firmness and punctilious correctness, under the requirements of state legislation and the prodding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Yet there was little dissolving of barriers beyond the requirements of the state law. There remain segregation of spirit, race feeling, bitterness, and segregation of social activities, all the more obvious with whites and Negroes in the same building. The local Negroes were preponderately in favor of moving slowly within the limits of good will, but the change was forced by the national organization.

In other communities, such as Burlington, New Jersey, both desegregation and integration were achieved, ahead of legal requirements, by the mutual confidence, restraint, and sense of social responsibility of both white and colored citizens. A number of communities over the country took this course.

The point is that while under some circumstances formal desegregation may be brought about by external compulsion, and while such actions as the United States Supreme Court decision on segregation may help to create a favorable climate, yet the actual elimination of barriers remains a community problem, and can be achieved only by a favorable community spirit. In this respect, as in others, the school is primarily a community affair. Efforts to shortcut due process of social change seldom bear the fruit which their authors expected of them.

The primeval community, through hundreds of thousands of years of experience on the community level, developed ways of child development, and methods of arriving at unity of feeling, judgment and purpose, which have profound significance for today. Much of this value remains, so "native" to us that it is almost unrecognized, in our community life. Any educational system which divorces its children from direct participation in community life and prevents them from participating actively in it, may be, as Pestalozzi expressed it, only "little more than a method of shriveling up our generation."

—A. E. M. and G. M.

THE PROSPECTS FOR COMMUNAL SOCIETIES

Communal associations—colonies, communities, fellowships, phalansteries—have often been established, but usually in modern times they have been short-lived. The relatively few exceptions have been religious fellowships, and usually after the first burst of enthusiasm is passed even these do not increase further except by births within the membership.

Yet communal living is nothing new. Most aboriginal, primitive life was communal, as much of it is today. Among Pueblo and other Indians of our Southwest, most property is held in common, and farming and hunting are community undertakings. Similar social organization seemed to have once existed over most of the continent north of the Aztec region. Morton, in his *Manners and Customs of the [New England] Indians*, written about 1637, declared: "All things are used in common amongst them; . . . and are therein so compassionate that, rather than one should starve through want, they would starve all." Practically the whole of South America was communal in its social organization when Europeans first visited it. Primitive Africa was largely communal.

What has happened which has changed the habits of men? Why have most modern communal efforts been abortive? Orderly, thoroughgoing study of the subject would seem to be desirable.

The "Group Farming Research Institute," established in New York several years ago by Edward A. Norman, with Henrik Infield as its Director and editor, has undertaken to survey the field, not only of group farming, but of cooperative communities in general. Often what seems to be a minor movement fails to have adequate appraisal and records. Norman and Infield have persisted in surveying the field and in reporting on it. The quarterly magazine, *Cooperative Living*, now in its sixth year, and a number of books, are products of that sustained effort.*

*Those reviewed in this article are:

Utopia and Experiment, by Henrik F. Infield (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1955, 320 pages, \$4.00). Volume I of International Library of the Sociology of Cooperation.

People in Ejidos, by Henrik F. Infield and Koka Freier (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1954, 151 pages, \$3.00). Vol. II of International Library of the Sociology of Cooperation.

"Gould Farm, A Therapeutic Cooperative Community," by Henrik Infield, *Cooperative Living* magazine, Spring 1955 (published by Group Farming Research Institute, Inc., Van Wagner Road, R.D. 3, Poughkeepsie, New York, \$1.00 per year).

The second volume in this "International Library of the Sociology of Cooperation" series—first to be published—is *People in Ejidos*. An ejido is a Mexican cooperative farm. Its organization and management are described. Before the Mexican revolution a large part of the agricultural production was on "haciendas," large plantations owned chiefly by men of Spanish descent, and manned by Indian serfs or peons in various stages between serfdom and freedom. As one phase of the revolution, the haciendas were expropriated by the government and turned over to those who had worked on them, to be administered as *ejidos*, or agricultural cooperatives. A "Bank of Ejidos" was established to finance and to supervise the transition.

The process was somewhat as though at the time of the American Civil War the national government had expropriated the southern cotton plantations and had turned them over to the former slaves, setting up a federal agency to supervise the process. The degree of preparation or lack of preparation of the workers—slaves in one case, and peons in the other—probably was about the same.

In addition to the old Spanish haciendas there was in the Laguna region the largest cotton plantation in the world, established by English capital on land newly reclaimed from the desert, and provided with irrigation. This is said to have been the finest example of cotton culture technology in existence. For instance, the English management had taken extreme care to prevent weeds from becoming established on this newly reclaimed desert land. The fields and the irrigation ditch banks were kept scrupulously free from weeds. The great plantation was just coming into full production. No profits had been taken out, but all had been "plowed back" in development and improvement. This plantation also was expropriated by the government, divided into many parts, and turned over to the workers and others, to be administered as ejidos.

Most Mexican ejidos were created under the presidency of Lazaro Cardenas in the nineteen-thirties. According to *People in Ejidos*, the census of 1940 listed 14,683 ejidos in existence in all Mexico. The mortality among them has been very high. In *Utopia and Experiment*, published in 1955, we read that the number of ejidos remaining "is said to be down to less than a thousand at present." We also read that only a small part of that smaller number are in successful operation.

This reviewer, through personal visits to some of the ejidos in 1939, and from more recent information from first-hand observers, has been informed of some of the conditions which followed their establishment. Where the excellently managed Laguna plantation had been broken up into numerous ejidos, the irrigation ditch banks had grown up heavily with weeds which dropped their seeds into the irrigation water and thereby thoroughly

seeded the cultivated land with weeds. The entire project had run down and was far less productive. In the English-built ample machine sheds were rows of agricultural implements purchased by those who had ejido funds in hand, which had remained in storage for years without being used.

On a rice-growing ejido in southern Michoacan, about 200 miles west of Mexico City, we heard from the *ejido* members the story of how the rice crop was taken over by the Ejido Bank. The going price was equivalent in American currency to about \$15 per barrel. The bank advanced the members of the ejido \$4 per barrel for living expenses, the balance to be paid when advances and administrative costs had been deducted. As a matter of fact, nothing but the preliminary advance ever was received by the ejido members. They looked back longingly to the good old days on the hacienda, when they were not robbed so completely. At the eastern extremity of Mexico when we asked about ejidos we were informed that the hacienda owners had been displaced by local politicians. So far as the workers could see, they simply had different masters. Sometimes the workers were vague as to whether there had been any change of management. On a sugar-producing ejido in northern Mexico the ejido members were keeping the wheels turning in a deteriorating way, with a certain spark of enthusiasm over their new-found freedom. According to Infield, in all Mexican ejidos between 1948 and 1952 the total production of cotton shrank by about one third, while the production of wheat fell to about a tenth of what it was in 1948-49.

For the most part, Infield describes some of the successful ejidos, and gives a picture of some degree of hope and enthusiasm. It is interesting that one of the most successful ejidos he describes is under the direction of a man who took over and runs the place with an attitude of authority, very similar to that of a humane, old-time hacienda owner. In this case there was willing acquiescence in humane, unselfish dictatorship, but not co-operation among equals. One gets an impression from the book of honest, but very sketchy reporting.

Where only perhaps one in a hundred of the ejidos which were established has survived and succeeded, it would be interesting to know why the greater number failed, and what became of the workers and of the land in case of those failures. The book gives us little information on that subject. It seems probable that the inexperience of the former peons in self-direction and in management affairs would have made success of these undertakings improbable, even if there had been no other limitations.

It would be interesting also to know whether the sense of the dignity of freedom was greater among the peons who inherited the ejidos and then failed in the cooperative effort than among American Negroes who were

freed and given no land, or among Mexican peons who were freed and left to shift for themselves. But chiefly one wonders whether the approximately 99% of failure would not have been less if the ejidos had been broken up, and if each peon had been given a small piece of land for his own, where the operation would have been more nearly within his range of competence, and where the stimulus of more immediate self-interest would have been present. There probably were some such cases, for which we have no reports. The study gives almost no information or suggestion on such matters. An adequate study of the Mexican ejido system would be desirable. This book makes no pretensions to being such. According to the book, such a study is under way by Clarence Senior, a long-time ardent supporter of the Mexican revolution. A study by a disinterested, objective student might also be desirable.

Yet Infield is not giving us a history of the Mexican revolution, but a picture of successful cooperative farming. Every such case helps to fill out the record and to throw light on the possibilities. The fact that some succeeded even for a limited period suggests that success may not be impossible. The book would be more valuable if the inquiries had been more thorough and penetrating.

The book *Utopia and Experiment* has two purposes. First in presenting a collection of articles from the five years of *Cooperative Living* magazine it includes descriptions of cooperative communities in this and other countries. This summing up of current experience in the field, so far as it is adequate and representative, is of much value. Second, there is a discussion of the principles of "sociometry" and a presentation of experiments with quantitative "sociometric tests" of social characteristics of individual members of cooperatives, and from these, forecasts of the prospects of success or failure of the various community projects.

It is an accepted generalization in science that wherever significant definitive measurements can be made and published, the progress of science is advanced. However, if concentration of attention on obvious quantitative measurements prevents the recognition of major, though perhaps less measurable, controlling factors, the process may be inappropriate.

In the measurements made at Gould Farm, reported in *Cooperative Living* for Spring, 1955, the process of "sociometry" is illustrated in detail. (Gould Farm is a cooperative community where overstressed persons may come for relaxation and recuperation.) Questionnaires were circulated which, in addition to eliciting information on such matters as age, marital condition, and duration of residence at the farm, also called for ratings on the degree of happiness of the staff members and guests, the nature of their wants, the degree of cooperativeness, etc. This data was then treated sta-

tistically, and along with the results of general inquiries, was made the basis of an appraisal.

One of the major difficulties of Gould Farm is that young people do not choose to join its staff of workers. The average age of staff workers is above sixty. Unless this difficulty can be relieved, the prospects of the community are not bright. Very little light was thrown on this issue by the statistical study. A more penetrating though less formal inquiry probably would have disclosed what from other sources of information we believe may be a chief difficulty. Through lack of financial resources, the rank and file of the staff are so poorly paid that they cannot secure their own homes, can make little or no provision for the future, and cannot provide for the adequate education of their children. They become discouraged and disillusioned, and leave. Despite this problem, during the past forty years Gould Farm has proved its worth as a therapeutic agency, by being a place ruled by kindness and cooperation, where persons under stress may share in the work of the community and recover poise and strength.

The discussion of the Amana Community in Iowa, and of the Hutterite communities in South Dakota, are interesting. Yet, if we are to come to understand why modern cooperative communities have not thriven more effectively there will need to be more penetrating study than is provided in the book *Utopia and Experiment*. Amana in Iowa existed as a strictly cooperative community for a century. Then it gave up that structure for a corporate organization with greater recognition of individuality. The reasons for that change were not made clear in this account.

No such community is isolated from the world, and every one tends to be borne along by the current of the times. Even if the cooperative life had been better than the life in surrounding Iowa, this current of things might have brought about the change. Yet at Amana there were other factors. For at least a generation past the younger members craved a degree of self-direction and of freedom of action which the community denied. As much as thirty years ago a considerable part of the younger members were leaving the community.

Noncompetitive communal life tended to run at a slow pace. We were told that when the community woolen mill was built, the contract for the construction was let to an outside contractor, with the understanding that community men would be employed on the work. Our information is that the community members worked at so much slower a pace than the regular employees of the contractor that he protested that he could not do the work for the price specified. The community members recognized the difference in rates of work, and made adjustments in the price. Such factors are almost entirely omitted in this description.

Somewhat the same is true of the description of the Hutterite communities of South Dakota. There is scarcely a hint of unsatisfactory elements in the organization. Before the Second World War, when the major colonies were in South Dakota, we were informed from a Hutterite source that the discontent among the young people was great, that a considerable part of them left the communities, and that there were more Hutterites among those who had left than among those who had remained. A few years ago a member of the staff of Community Service spent about two months in the Hutterite communities that had moved to Canada as a result of their treatment in South Dakota. This observer reported that a very striking characteristic was the spiritual dictatorship which was exercised by the elders. A comment by the spiritual head of one of the communities illustrated this condition. He said, "You must break a boy's spirit by the time he is eleven, or it is too late." Here again, limitation of freedom seems to have been a major factor.

In the Russian kolkhoz or communal farms it seems that there is similar difficulty. In Finland this reviewer talked with a man who had recently come from such a farm in Russia, and who knew the conditions on other farms. He said that the regimentation of life on these farms was distasteful, and that so far as exodus was allowed the collective farms were becoming the domains of old people. Younger life deserted them.

When we see this pattern repeated under a variety of conditions we begin to wonder whether each case is controlled by peculiar local circumstances, or whether there is not some common underlying cause. If there are such underlying causes of the very frequent failure of cooperative communities it would be well to find out what they are.

Some of the cravings and needs of men seem on the surface to be mutually exclusive. Men crave society and mutuality; but also they crave separateness and individuality, that is, freedom. Normal, run-of-the-world society is a mixture of both. Some idealists, observing excessive development of selfishness, competition and separateness, take individual self-reliance and self-direction to be inherently evil. That being the case, they think, the more completely they are cooperative and communal, the more nearly ideal they are. So we have infringement upon individuality in cooperative and communal societies. But the craving for self-identification and self-expression persists, and perhaps it is for that reason that most of the extremely communal societies are short-lived, unless they exist under pressure. In Russia the cooperative farms are continued by government influence, in Israel by the critical situation of the country. Even in Israel, where the kvutzot have been the most successful of all modern voluntary cooperative communities, their rate of multiplication and development seems to have greatly slowed

down, and recent first-hand reports indicate that their spirit of enthusiasm is waning.

Men crave both security and freedom. Communalized societies, such as Amana, the Hutterite villages in South Dakota and Manitoba, the kvutzot of Palestine, and the Bruderhof communities of Paraguay, England and America, may give a high degree of security, but they do not give freedom of the individual within the community. The natural craving for freedom of action persists, and when the initial zeal of the organizers wanes, their growth stops, except perhaps by births within the community.

Security, and freedom of self-determination, both are values. A good way of life will try to recognize them both in right relation. It does not lie in giving a monopoly of loyalty to one of these and suppressing the other.

Recognition of both these elements was the course taken at Celo Community in North Carolina. In that undertaking, where there has been insistence in selecting members on the basis of mutual respect and confidence and good will, there was no prescription as to the degree or intensity of communalism, but it was left for the community to find its way by experience. At one time the community owned a herd of cattle. It was decided that this activity had better be left to individual initiative. The community owned its own agricultural machinery, but came to the conclusion that this would be used more effectively and more economically if owned by one or more individuals. On the other hand, the community has a cooperative store. It has locally organized group medical service. The land is owned by the community, but lifetime leases are given to members. Any matter affecting the common interest, such as timber cutting and mineral extraction, either on unoccupied community land or on the individual holdings, is controlled by the community as a whole, even though carried out by individual initiative and responsibility. The community has "work days" when the members as a whole work for their common interests. It maintains a "capital fund" from which loans are made to meet the needs of members.

It was planned at one time to have the several homes in a compact group of a few acres, for the sake of more intimate companionship, and for economy in installing utilities. As individual choices of building sites were made, however, it turned out that the houses average somewhere about a quarter of a mile apart. Each site is individually chosen.

Thus a pattern is taking shape which seems to fit the desires and needs of the community members. It combines much community of effort with much freedom.

This attitude is not satisfactory to Mr. Infield. In *Utopia and Experiment* he wrote concerning Celo Community: "We could not help wondering whether the organizational abstinence had not its dangers. It was cer-

tainly sensible to keep away from blueprints. But was it equally wise to abandon all specification of goals? How could one estimate progress or failure if no point of reference was established? It seemed to us as if this was driving the 'scientific attitude' too far." (The facts and statistical data concerning Celo included in that book dated 1955 describe conditions of ten years earlier.)

Celo is one of the oldest non-sectarian "intentional communities" in the United States. The internal harmony and the adjustment of members to reasonably satisfactory careers probably never was on as high a level as now. In some respects developments have taken a quite different turn from that anticipated by the founders. It was expected that the chief activities would be agriculture and some community industries. On the contrary, the members have found a wide variety of callings according to their individual abilities and interests. These include editing a county newspaper, building contracting, operating a wood-working shop, packaging and selling standard drugs of high quality for hospitals and co-op stores, teaching school, operating a summer camp, operating a bookmobile, running a trucking and general service business, operating a cooperative store, operating a medical and health center for a large rural area, production of certain craft articles, and operation of a craft shop. Agriculture has come to be only for home consumption.

Is it not possible that the absence of a specific ideology, and in fact a dislike for ideologies, and the normal discriminating development of individual and community life, have been advantageous rather than harmful? Is it not possible that rigidity of pattern and limitation of responsible, free expression of personality have been among the more important reasons for the usual short life of an ideological cooperative community? Life persistently breaks over the boundaries of ideologies.

The ancient community had many great values, some of them so important that it is doubtful whether human society can survive without them. Urban society survives because it is constantly refreshed and regenerated by influx of life from small communities. However, in many indigenous societies over the world the values of community did not include freedom. In what was probably the greatest communal society the world has known before the present century, ancient Peru, all-pervasive, totalitarian dictatorship was a dominant characteristic. Some primitive societies, such as that of the Eskimos, had achieved a rare combination of freedom and mutuality, but in many such societies rigid conformity to the prevailing pattern was enforced.

Wherever a society has greatly erred in one direction, idealists and purists, in their eagerness to escape such error, often go to the extreme of

trying to eliminate all traces of the characteristics which had developed to extreme. In the Orient, where excessive ostentation in clothing and other appointments is characteristic, holy men commonly appear as dirty beggars. Soiled rags for clothing and matted, uncombed hair are evidence of virtue. Where there is excessive wealth, Franciscan poverty is a reaction. In many societies where sex standards have decayed, celibacy is a mark of holy purpose. Where selfishness and ruthless competition prevail, idealists may react to the other extreme of communal living, with the sharing of all things. But always the craving for freedom and self-direction rebels against the resulting regimentation of life, and the excessively communal societies wither.

Freedom and mutuality are contrasting values, both of which men crave. Any society which ignores or repudiates either of these elements in the interests of the other is reducing the probability of its own survival and success. Promoters of communal communities may well consider this statement. Right proportion between the two will not result from any heroic or consecrated act of abnegation, or from any "going all the way," but from constant effort to achieve balance and wholeness. For that reason the unplanned, rough-and-tumble life of an average American community may be more normal and wholesome than that of a fully communal community. Intelligent, critical purposefulness may produce something better than either.

Now available in bound volume:

COMMUNITY SERVICE NEWS—Issues for 1952-53 (Vols. X-XI) \$6.50

Includes the book, *Industries for Small Communities*, issued as Nos. 1-2 of Volume XI. Dark green buckram binding, uniform with previous years.

Also available, limited supply: Vols. IV-V, \$5; VI-VII, \$5; VIII-IX, \$5.50. All eight years (Vols. IV-XI, 1946-53, in four bound volumes) \$19.00.

Industries for Small Communities, With Cases from Yellow Springs, by Arthur E. Morgan. Selected by *Library Journal* as one of 50 best business books of 1953. \$2.00 (paper binding \$1.50).

Order from:

COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC., Box 243, Yellow Springs, Ohio